

C/CAG

CITY/COUNTY ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS OF SAN MATEO COUNTY

*Atherton • Belmont • Brisbane • Burlingame • Colma • Daly City • East Palo Alto • Foster City • Half Moon Bay • Hillsborough • Menlo Park
Millbrae • Pacifica • Portola Valley • Redwood City • San Bruno • San Carlos • San Mateo • San Mateo County • South San Francisco • Woodside*

AGENDA

The next meeting of the
BICYCLE AND PEDESTRIAN ADVISORY COMMITTEE (BPAC)
will be as follows.

Date: Thursday, April 28, 2011
6:30 p.m. to 9:30 p.m.
Place: San Mateo City Hall
330 West 20th Avenue
San Mateo, California
Conference Room C (across from Council Chambers)

*******PLEASE NOTE 6:30 P.M. START TIME*******

PLEASE CALL TOM MADALENA (599-1460) IF YOU ARE UNABLE TO ATTEND.

- | | | | |
|----|---|---|-----------|
| 1. | Call To Order | Action
(Grocott) | |
| 2. | Pledge of Allegiance | (Grocott) | |
| 3. | Public Comment On Items Not On The Agenda | Presentations are
limited to 3 minutes
per speaker. | |
| 4. | Minutes of the March 24, 2011 Meeting | Action
(Grocott) | Pages 1-2 |
| 5. | San Mateo County Bicycle and Pedestrian
Program Joint Call For Projects FY 2012 & FY
2013 Application Scoring and Ranking | Action
(Hoang) | Pages 3-8 |
| 6. | Member Communications | Information
(Grocott) | |
| 7. | Adjournment | Action
(Grocott) | |

C/CAG

CITY/COUNTY ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS OF SAN MATEO COUNTY

*Atherton • Belmont • Brisbane • Burlingame • Colma • Daly City • East Palo Alto • Foster City • Half Moon Bay • Hillsborough • Menlo Park
Millbrae • Pacifica • Portola Valley • Redwood City • San Bruno • San Carlos • San Mateo • San Mateo County • South San Francisco • Woodside*

NOTE: All items appearing on the agenda are subject to action by the Committee. Actions recommended by staff are subject to change by the Committee.

Other enclosures/Correspondence

- None.

If you have any questions regarding the C/CAG Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee Meeting Agenda, please contact Richard Napier at 650-599-1420 or Tom Madalena at 650-599-1460.

NOTE: Persons with disabilities who require auxiliary aids or services in attending and participating in this meeting should contact Nancy Blair at 650 599-1406, five working days prior to the meeting date.

The following BPAC meeting will be held on Thursday May 26th, 2011.

Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee (BPAC)
Meeting Minutes
March 24, 2011

1. Call to Order

Chair Grocott called the Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee (BPAC) Meeting to order at 6:35 pm.

Members Present:

Cathy Baylock, Karyl Matsumoto, Ken Ibarra, Judi Mosqueda, David Alfano, Naomi Patridge, Cory Roay, Frank Markowitz, Steve Schmidt, Marge Colapietro, Cathleen Baker

Members Absent:

Ian Bain, Paul Grantham

Staff/Guests Attending:

Sandy Wong, Rich Napier, John Hoang, Kenneth Chin, Susan Wheeler, Gilbert Yau, Pat Giorni, Mike Harding, Karen Kinsert, Rich Haygood, Caryl Gay, Augustine Chou, Jane Gomery, Shirley Chan, Mo Sharma, Cyrus Kianpour, Sean Charpentigo, Al Meckler, Christian Hammach, Steve Beroldo, Randolph Craig, Vanessa Castaneda, Dong Nguyen, Russel Averhart, Van Ocampo, David Rogers, Khee Lim, Steve Rhodes, Jim Shannon, Jason Nesdahl, Joel Slavitt, Melanie Choy, Joe Hurley

3. Public Comment On Items Not On The Agenda

Pat Giorni asked two questions: 1) she has a couple of support letters for projects submitted to the "call for projects". Who can she provide the letters to in order for this body to see them? 2) Does anyone have a problem of her recording this meeting because she does not like taking notes. Chair Grocott asked if anyone would object. There was no response. Chair Grocott asked Mr. Napier, C/CAG Executive Director, to address Ms. Giorni's first question. Mr. Napier said to give the letters to staff and we will provide them to the BPAC members and the TA Selection Panel, but must be done ASAP.

4. Minutes of February 24, 2011 Meeting

Motion: Member Baylock moved/Member Colapietro seconded approval of the February 24, 2011 minutes. Motion carried unanimously.

Member Alfano asked to clarify a statement from public comment in the February 24, 2011 meeting minutes that related to whether C/CAG staff spoke with San Mateo County Transportation Authority (TA) staff prior to making a recommendation to the C/CAG Board of Directors to not limit the number of applications for the Joint Call for Projects to three as the BPAC had recommended. Rich Napier said that yes C/CAG staff spoke to TA staff prior to making the recommendation to the C/CAG Board of Directors.

5. Joint Call for Projects for the San Mateo County Bicycle and Pedestrian Program FY 2012 and 2013 Project Applications and Presentations

Staff from San Mateo County jurisdictions and Bay Area Rapid Transit (BART) gave presentations on their project applications for the Joint Call for Projects for the San Mateo County Bicycle and Pedestrian Program for FY 2012 and 2013. Member Baylock asked if the BPAC members could receive the pre-scoring sheet from staff. John Hoang, C/CAG staff, stated that he would provide it within two weeks.

6. Member Communications

None

7. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 10:03 pm.

C/CAG AGENDA REPORT

Date: April 28, 2011
To: Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee
From: John Hoang
Subject: San Mateo County Bicycle and Pedestrian Program Joint Call For Projects FY 2012 & FY 2013 Application Scoring and Ranking

(For further information contact John Hoang at 363-4105)

RECOMMENDATION

That the Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee score and rank the project applications for the San Mateo County Bicycle and Pedestrian Program for FY 2012 & FY 2013.

FISCAL IMPACT

The Transportation Development Act (TDA) Article 3 Bicycle and Pedestrian project funding is estimated to be \$1,138,972. The Measure A funding, administered by the Transportation Authority (TA) is estimated to be \$3,000,000. The total combined funding available is estimated at \$4,138,972.

SOURCE OF FUNDS

- TDA Article 3 funds are derived from the following sources:
 - Local Transportation Funds (LTF), derived from a ¼ cent of the general sales tax collected statewide
 - State Transit Assistance fund (STA), derived from the statewide sales tax on gasoline and diesel fuel.
- Measure A funds are derived from a half-cent sales tax in San Mateo County.

BACKGROUND/DISCUSSION

A Joint Call for Projects (CFP) for the San Mateo County Bicycle and Pedestrian Program was issued on February 14, 2011, soliciting local jurisdictions to submit applications for bicycle and pedestrian projects. A Joint CFP Workshop was held on March 8, 2011 for potential project sponsors. Applications were due on March 17, 2011, and a total of **41** project applications were received from **18** different jurisdictions, including BART, requesting a total amount of **\$11,168,653**.

Project sponsors presented their respective projects to the BPAC and TA Panel at the March 24, 2011 BPAC meeting. On April 9, 2011, the BPAC and TA Panel members completed site visits to 10 projects (as noted in the attachment).

Staff provided BPAC members scores for the “objective” categories on April 1, 2011 (followed up with a revised version on April 15, 2011). The scored categories are as follows:

- Section III.c(1): Right-of-Way Certification
- Section III.c(2): Environmental Clearance
- Section VI.b: In CBPP or local plan
- Section VII.c & d: Local Match

Selection Process

BPAC members should evaluate and score all 41 projects prior to this meeting. Members will have the opportunity to discuss the projects further and make adjustments to their scores, if necessary, during the meeting. Once discussions are completed, members will then provide their respective scores to staff for tallying and ranking of the projects. The result will be a list of projects that are ranked from 1 to 41 based on average scores. The BPAC will use this priority list as a basis to establish a list of projects recommended for TDA Article 3 funding.

Independently, the TA Panel will also prioritize all 41 projects and develop a separate list of projects recommended for funding. TA and C/CAG staff will then meet to reconcile these two lists and establish the final list of recommended projects to receive Measure A and TDA Article 3 funding. The final recommendations will be presented to the Committee at the May 2011 BPAC meeting.

ATTACHMENTS

- Project Applications Summary List
- Scoring Sheet (*41 copies were provided to each member at the March 24th meeting*)

**JOINT CALL FOR PROJECTS
SAN MATEO COUNTY BICYCLE AND PEDESTRIAN PROGRAM
FY 2012 AND FY 2013
PROJECT APPLICATION SUMMARY**

No	Jurisdiction	Project Description	\$ Requested	Fund Preference	Partially Fund	Phasing
1	County of San Mateo 1*	Mirada Road Rehabilitation and Bicycle Trail	\$ 1,800,000	TA	Yes	Yes
2	County of San Mateo 2	Alpine Road Resurfacing and Bicycle Route	\$ 150,000	None	Yes	Yes
3	County of San Mateo 3	Crystal Springs Regional Trail South of Highway 92	\$ 231,827	None	No	No
4	East Palo Alto 1	Pedestrian and Bicycle Trail Network Expansion	\$ 191,500	None	No	No
5	East Palo Alto 2*	101 Pedestrian/Bicycle Overcrossing	\$ 300,000	None	Yes	Yes
6	Belmont	Ralston Avenue Pedestrian Route Improvements	\$ 250,000	None	Yes	Yes
7	BART	BART Bicycle Lockers	\$ 140,000	TA	Yes	Yes
8	Millbrae	Millbrae Class III Bike Signage	\$ 70,000	None	No	No
9	Brisbane	Retrofit Safety Systems at School Crossings	\$ 60,000	TDA Art. 3	No	Yes
10	Daly City	Lake Merced Blvd In-Pavement Crosswalk	\$ 77,000	TDA Art. 3	No	No
11	Menlo Park 1*	Alpine Road Bike Lane Improvements	\$ 78,000	None	No	No
12	Menlo Park 2	Citywide Wayfinding Signage	\$ 12,000	TDA Art. 3	No	No
13	Pacifica 1	Various School Illuminated Crosswalk	\$ 108,000	None	No	No
14	Pacifica 2	400 Esplanade Trail	\$ 220,000	TA	No	No
15	Pacifica 3*	Pacifica Headlands Trail	\$ 360,000	TA	No	Yes
16	San Carlos 1	San Carlos Ave. Bicycle and Pedestrian Improvements	\$ 67,250	TA	Yes	Yes
17	San Carlos 2*	101/Holly St. Grade Separated Path	\$ 100,000	TA	Yes	No
18	Redwood City 1	Brewster Ave. Pedestrian Improvements	\$ 734,000	TA	No	No
19	Redwood City 2	Brewster Ave. Bicycle Improvements	\$ 107,640	None	Yes	Yes
20	Redwood City 3	Hudson St. Bicycle and Pedestrian Improvements	\$ 532,640	TA	Yes	Yes
21	Redwood City 4	Massachusetts Ave. School Crosswalk In-Roadway Warning Light System	\$ 110,250	TA	No	No

**JOINT CALL FOR PROJECTS
SAN MATEO COUNTY BICYCLE AND PEDESTRIAN PROGRAM
FY 2012 AND FY 2013
PROJECT APPLICATION SUMMARY
(Continued)**

No	Jurisdiction	Project Description	\$ Requested	Fund Preference	Partially Fund	Phasing
22	San Bruno 1	Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan	\$ 75,000	TDA Art. 3	Yes	No
23	Woodside	School Safety Improvements	\$ 21,600	None	Yes	No
24	San Mateo 1	Downtown Bicycle Parking	\$ 98,783	None	Yes	Yes
25	San Mateo 2	Citywide Bicycle Striping and Signage	\$ 157,163	None	Yes	Yes
26	San Mateo 3	Hillsdale/US 101 Bridge	\$ 480,000	TA	No	No
27	San Mateo 4*	Bay to Transit Trail - Phase I	\$ 312,000	None	Yes	Yes
28	Half Moon Bay 1	Main St Bridge Bike Lanes and Sidewalks	\$ 500,000	None	Yes	No
29	Half Moon Bay 2*	Highway 1 Trail Extension - Ruisseau Francais to Roosevelt	\$ 250,000	None	Yes	Yes
30	Half Moon Bay 3	Highway 1 Trail Extension - Seymour to Wavcrest Road	\$ 250,000	None	Yes	Yes
31	Colma	Hillsdale Blvd Beautification	\$ 574,000	None	No	No
32	Burlingame 1	Burlingame Ave. Downtown Pedestrian and Bicycle Improvements	\$ 300,000	TA	Yes	No
33	Burlingame 2	East Side Bicycle Route Improvements	\$ 91,700	None	No	No
34	Burlingame 3*	West Side Bicycle Route Improvements	\$ 168,700	None	No	No
35	South San Francisco 1	Junipero Serra Blvd. Sidewalk	\$ 413,000	TA	Yes	Yes
36	South San Francisco 2	E. Grand Ave. Bike Lanes	\$ 337,400	TA	Yes	Yes
37	South San Francisco 3	Alta Loma Stairs Bike Ramp	\$ 245,000	TA	Yes	Yes
38	South San Francisco 4*	El Camino Real Sidewalk at Kaiser Permanente	\$ 665,000	TA	Yes	Yes
39	South San Francisco 5	Sharrows and Striping Program	\$ 81,200	TDA Art. 3	Yes	Yes
40	South San Francisco 6	Pedestrian Crossing Improvement at El Camino H.S.	\$ 98,000	TA	Yes	Yes
41	San Bruno 2*	Transit Corridor Pedestrian Connection	\$ 350,000	TA	Yes	Yes
TOTAL AMOUNT REQUESTED			\$ 11,168,653			

* Selected for Site Visit on April 9, 2011

JOINT CALL FOR PROJECTS
SMCTA MEASURE A AND C/CAG TDA ARTICLE 3
 BICYCLE AND PEDESTRIAN PROGRAM
 FISCAL YEAR 2012 and/or 2013 SCORING SHEET

I. PROJECT NAME AND FUNDING REQUEST			
a. AGENCY / SPONSOR:		RATER:	
b. PROJECT NAME:			
c. FUNDING PREFERENCE: <input type="checkbox"/> SMCTA <input type="checkbox"/> TDA ARTICLE 3 (C/CAG) <input type="checkbox"/> No Preference			
d. TOTAL FUNDS REQUESTED:			

II. PROJECT SCREENING / BASIC ELIGIBILITY			
a. Project Sponsor is San Mateo Co. or City	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> (No disqualifies project)		
b. Design meets CALTRANS standards?	Yes or N/A <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> ("No" disqualifies project)		
c. CEQA approval	Yes or N/A <input type="checkbox"/> No* <input type="checkbox"/> ("No" Disqualifies project for TDA Article 3 funding)		
Evaluation Criteria (Parts II – IV)	Scale	Max Points	Points Assigned

III. GENERAL INFORMATION			
Clear and complete proposal	0 or 4 (A zero score disqualifies project.)	4	
c(1). Right-of-Way Certification complete	0 – No 3 – Yes (Completed or N/A)	3	
c(2). Permits, Agreements and/or Environmental Clearance obtained?	0 – No 3 – Yes (or N/A)	3	
Subtotal		10	

IV. PROJECT NEED			
a. Does the project meet commuter and/or recreational purpose?	0 - No 10 - Yes	10	
b. Improves Safety	0 -None 3 - Little 5 - Moderate 7 – Substantial 10 - Significant	10	
Subtotal		20	

V. POLICY CONSISTENCY			
a. Is the project consistent with approved policy documents?	0 - None 5 - Moderate 10 - Significant	10	
Subtotal		10	

VI. STATE OF READINESS			
a. Project is a result of a public planning process?	0 - No 3 - Yes	3	
b. Part of the Comprehensive Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan's (CBPP) Countywide Bikeway Network, located in a Pedestrian Focus Area identified in the CBPP, or identified in a local Bicycle/Pedestrian Plan?	0 - None 4 - Local Project 7 - C/CAG Project	7	
c. Is there demonstrated local support; letters attached?	0 - None 2 - Little 5 - Moderate 7 - Strong	7	
d - f. Is a plan for funding shortfall identified, including partial funding or phasing?	0 - No 3 - Yes	3	
Subtotal		20	
VII. EFFECTIVENESS			
a. How well does the proposed project complement the existing bicycle and pedestrian facilities?	0 – Does Not 5 – Moderately 10 – Substantially	10	
b. Does the project provide access to bicycle and/or pedestrian facilities in high use activity centers?	0 – No 10 - Yes	10	
c & d. Leveraging of funds (Local Match as % of total requested funds)	0 - 0% match 2 - 10% match 4 - 20% match 6 - 30% match 8 - 40% match 10 - 50% match	10	
Subtotal		30	
VIII. SUSTAINABILITY			
a. Does the project provide an environmental benefit?	0 -No 3 - Yes	3	
b. Does the project provide or improve facilities to or at TOD?	0 - No 4 - Yes	4	
c. Does the project support economic development?	0 -No 3 - Yes	3	
Subtotal		10	
TOTAL SCORE		100	